

**Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries
Discussion Group
(Big Heads)**

Minutes

June 24, 2005

ALA Annual 2005

**Meeting changed from Embassy Suites Chicago Lakefront,
Chicago River Ballroom, to AMC Theaters, Theatre 11**

Recorded by Angela Kinney, Library of Congress (anki@loc.gov)

**The Big Heads Web Site established by Library of Congress is at:
<http://www.loc.gov/library/bigheads>**

Agenda

In attendance

- Leighann Ayers (University of Michigan)
- Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester)
- Karen Calhoun: incoming chair (Cornell University)
- Beth Picknally Camden (University of Virginia)
- Mechael Charbonneau (Indiana University)
- Cynthia Clark (New York Public Library)
- Chris Cole (National Agricultural Library)
- Katharine Farrell (Princeton University)
- Robin Fradenburgh (University of Texas at Austin)
- Lisa German (University of Illinois)
- Nancy Gibbs (Duke University)
- Peggy Johnson (University of Minnesota)
- Arno Kastner (New York University)
- Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley)
- Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine)
- James Mouw (University of Chicago)
- Rebecca Mugridge (Pennsylvania State University)
- Joyce Ogburn (University of Washington)
- Jane Ouderkirk (Harvard University)
- Cynthia Shelton (University of California at Los Angeles)
- Joan Swanekamp (Yale University)
- Vitus Tang (Stanford University)
- Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress)
- Robert Wolven: outgoing chair (Columbia University)
- Margaretta Yarborough (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
- Irene Zimmerman (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Business and Updates (40 minutes)

1. Introductions, announcements

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) opened the meeting by asking if there were any announcements or updates. Joyce Ogburn, head of technical services at **University of Washington**, announced that she has been named director of technical services at **University of Utah** effective July 2005. Wolven also announced that Karen Calhoun (**Cornell University**) is the incoming chair of Big Heads. Wolven will step down as the chair of Big Heads as of this meeting.

2. Election of vice chair/chair-elect:

Big Heads committee members nominated Katharine Farrell from **Princeton University** as vice chair. All members were in favor, thereby electing Farrell to the post.

3. Schedule of future meetings:

The American Library Association is adjusting slots for meetings to try to bring more uniformity in meeting times. Committee members considered a number of options for times to meet, by soliciting comments via a survey administered on the Big Heads listserv. Four options for new meeting times were considered. The 9:30am-12:30pm slot used for Big Heads meetings in the past is no longer available.

Option 1: reserve for 8:00-10:00am and 10:30am-12:30 pm and end the meeting at 11:30am. Break from 10:00 to 10:30 am

Option 2: reserve for 8:00-10:00am and 10:30am-12:00 pm, and begin the meeting at 8:30 am. Break from 10:00 to 10:30 am

Option 3: reserve for 8:00-10:00 am and shorten the meeting to 2 hours

Option 4: reserve for 10:30am-12:00pm or 10:30am-12:30 pm, shortening the meeting by 1 to 1½ hours.

The committee received 18 responses to the survey and option 2 was chosen. Big Heads meetings will now be reserved for 8:00-10:00 am and 10:30 am-12:00 pm, with the meeting beginning at 8:30 am and a break given from 10:00-10:30 am. Option 1 was a close second. There was general sentiment that the meeting should remain 3 hours long, although many expressed that with a good agenda, the meeting could be shortened to two hours. The committee will still meet on Fridays.

4. Updates:

Shared Cataloging project:

Lee Leighton (**Berkeley**) announced that Harvard, Yale, Stanford and Berkeley are working with Glenn Patton of OCLC to create a 9xx field to include in the records from the Shared Cataloging Project to overlay records in OCLC. These libraries have discussed doing maps, video slides and photographs as part of the project. Maps constitute the largest backlog the libraries need to work on and most are in European languages. The libraries are considering other formats as well and are currently working on Western

European monographs. Cindy Shelton (**UCLA**) asked how the libraries decide who does what. Leighton replied that Berkeley is doing Spanish, Stanford is working on French and Portuguese, Yale is doing its Italian backlog and Harvard is working on German. The libraries are splitting up the assignment because of the longevity of the project. Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) inquired as to whether there is any order to processing of the materials. Leighton replied that the libraries are first trying to identify materials with copy already available in the utilities.

Arno Kastner (**New York University**) wanted to know whether the libraries involved in the project had determined that there is overlap. Leighton responded that libraries participating in the project have not done anything yet about eliminating overlap, but are talking to Glenn Patton about how that can be done. Harvard is working now on the oldest items in their backlog. Harvard recognizes that there is very little copy anywhere for their portion of the project and is considering running tests to see if there is overlap in their acquisition of receipts. Kastner asked what alert mechanism is being used to let other libraries know these items are cataloged. Leighton replied that there is a code in the records to identify them as part of the project. Karen Smith-Yoshimura (audience, RLG) asked if the existence of the 9xx is going to be communicated and the response was yes.

Rich Cat Group:

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) said there are several libraries doing things to enhance records, including scanning and indexing of content. Efforts are underway to maximize the benefits of sharing the results of the work. This discussion has taken place at many libraries and he is interested in the mechanics of how this is done (from Big Heads Minutes, ALA Midwinter 2005). Wolven said ways are being explored to see how the Rich Cat Project can be worked on cooperatively. A year from now there will be an update on this project at the ALA Annual 2006 Big Heads meeting.

Subject categorization of e-journals:

This project involves subject access through weblit e-journals. Big Heads performed a survey of weblit e-journals to gauge usage. The first survey did not garner sufficient responses, so another survey was taken, attempting to gather quantitative information. The survey garnered no more than two responses, most likely because it was distributed late. Wolven looked at 20 sites and noted that 60% have a browsing list for e-journals, half of which are hierarchical. He looked at categories in the hierarchical list and the number of categories ranges around 40, with a total of 47 different terms used. Ten categories were unique, with the most popular lists being architecture and mathematics. Wolven also examined usage data on two sites. Each showed on the web page that most of the usage came from browsing. Wolven detected three variations of usage and noted also that local staff at the sites he looked at decided on the categories and placed the e-journals in them. Wolven asked if there was any interest in coming up with a more uniform approach to gathering more data and whether there was some action that should arise from Big Heads out of the survey.

Cynthia Clark (**New York Public Library**) said she does not think standard categories are

the solution, but that a search pilot might influence categories libraries develop. Karen Calhoun (**Cornell**) said that it is a political process to assign high-level categories and that it might not be possible to come up with uniform categories. Libraries might create a tool in their bibliographic databases to develop subject categories, generating numbers from LC call numbers. Arno Kastner said that **New York University** is using the call number as an indicator for staff to assign local subject headings. This method involves lots of tweaking and is not totally satisfactory. Wolven asked if anyone wished to explore use of an automated method to assign subject categories to weblisted e-journals. Wolven ended the discussion by saying that some pointers to different approaches might be useful.

From handout:

Browsable Subject Access to E-Journals

About 60% of Big Heads libraries have a browsable subject list for e-journals. (Defined as a weblisted subject categories that is, or can be, limited to e-journals).

About half the lists are single-level (flat). The other half are hierarchical, with 2-4 levels of subcategories.

The number of categories at first level (for flat lists) or second level (for hierarchical lists) ranges from around 40 to around 150.

Overlap: Comparing terms starting with A or M on 6 lists

Total categories:	47
On 1 site only:	25
On 2 sites	10
On 3 sites	4
On 4 sites	4
On 5 sites	2
On 6 sites	2

Usage: (Data from 2 sites only)

Subject browsing accounts for 20-25% of all browse access.

On e-journal web page, total browsing and searching roughly equal.

Prepared for Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries, June 2005 meeting.

Discussion Topics:

5. Moving toward e-only access for journals: impact on staff (20 minutes)

Are we seeing savings? If so, are they fungible? What are the new demands and how are they being met?

Rebecca Mugridge reported that at **Pennsylvania State University**, with the cancellation of print journal subscriptions to cover inflation of electronic resources, core tasks associated with management of print have declined. They have not seen staff savings but rather a shift in the work. They estimate that they need 1-1.5 fewer FTEs for core check-in and claiming tasks, and staff has shifted to higher-level maintenance functions and projects that have otherwise lagged behind. Licensing and negotiations will continue to require very specialized skills and knowledge and is currently the responsibility of the Electronic Resource and Copyright Librarian. Technical service staff very experienced in managing data and solving problems in the print serial world can transfer those skills to electronic resource management. Staff formerly assigned core tasks such as check-in has begun to assist with reconciliation of the large e-journal packages. There are often significant differences between what they should be receiving versus what the publisher says they have paid for. Each of the large e-journal packages has generated a new workload. All check-in staff has participated in projects to create order records for the e-content piece of large e-journal packages, and staff has also assisted with refunding projects. Penn State's in-house ERLIC (Electronic Resource Licensing Center) ERM has been used to maintain licensing data and a higher-level staff person has to date maintained it. Whether they continue with the in-house system or move to a vendor solution, they expect that other staff will eventually begin to maintain data on ERLIC as well. As protocols are refined for responding to ER help requests (currently the responsibility of the Electronic Resources & Copyright Librarian and Electronic Resources Specialist), other staff will be assigned as necessary. SFX KnowledgeBase maintenance and projects related to SFX and MetaLib is another future possibility for staff assignment.

Karen Calhoun (**Cornell**) reminded the group of a JSTOR study that some Big Heads libraries participated in to prepare an evaluation on the cost and savings relative to print as opposed to e-journals (<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub127/contents.html>). The study found that annual labor costs are substantially lower, on a per-title basis, in electronic than in print format. The study laid out labor savings particularly in receipt and check-in, physical processing, stacks maintenance, and circulation that occur as a consequence of moving from print to electronic, and collected information on costs that can be reallocated to other areas of the budget.

Lee Leighton said that **Berkeley** is finding that low-level work is going away with the move toward more access to e-journals than print. E-resources management is now being done by higher-level staff and new work is emerging for technical staff. Lisa German said that **Illinois University** is getting 150-250 reference questions a month concerning e-journals, something that has never happened before. Cynthia Shelton said that **UCLA** has done a very detailed cost assessment at the unit level for all areas of processing and has looked at the cost of shelving for offsite storage. She wondered for those libraries that are realizing savings, what the time lag is between launching a cancellation project and the

time an institution realizes savings. She stated that UCLA canceled acquisition of print copies of journals this year and is anticipating future cost savings now that the institution is only acquiring e-journals.

Katharine Farrell stated that **Princeton** has seen a 30 percent drop in print journals acquired and a gradual shift from print to online journals. This year Princeton also witnessed a drop in serial volumes bound. Karen Calhoun (**Cornell**) said the university librarian asked her to do an analysis taking into account cancellation of print periodicals. Her analysis concluded that Cornell should see cost savings three years from now and significant savings in five years.

Jim Mouw (**University of Chicago**) noted that there is still a great deal of clerical work to be done. His institution has shifted staff from general processing areas to doing bibliographic records. Bob Wolven noted that (**Columbia**) has a simplified check-in and binding area and services are more centralized, with a move to acquiring electronic journals over print. Robin Fradenburgh said **University of Texas at Austin** has canceled most of its print journals for electronic and is creating new positions to manage the department handling serials, and shifting costs into hiring someone in charge of acquiring electronic journals. Irene Zimmerman noted that the **University of Wisconsin-Madison** has decentralized check-in and has reorganized the acquisitions department and is moving staff into areas dealing with all electronic resources, not just journals, putting those staff into a unit that will deal specifically with electronic issues.

Beacher Wiggins said the **Library of Congress** is attempting to move to canceling print over e-journals, but there is some resistance because of staff's lack of faith in the long-term sustainability of e-journals archiving. James Mouw stated that the decision to move from print to e-journals was made one journal at a time, not by top managers at **University of Chicago**, but rather by subject selectors. Cynthia Shelton said that **UCLA** had a breakthrough when they negotiated for renewal of e-access journals, asking for one shared print copy, and established guidelines for selectors. She said that UCLA has yet to cancel 95% of its print titles.

Joyce Ogburn mentioned that five years ago **University of Utah's** information resources council established principles for what to do in the age of e-resources. Her institution has started working with vendors on pricing levels for electronic serials. Jim Mouw (**University of Chicago**) affirmed that it is an ongoing process at his institution, where every year subject specialists go over print titles also available electronically and in doing so can justify print cancellations. Nancy Gibbs said **Duke University** is doing cancellations by package rather than individual units to make it easier to manage. Lisa German added that **Illinois University** worked with **Indiana University** and **Pennsylvania State University** staff to develop a print archive for Kluwer and Wiley titles. Illinois University has made major cancellations, done subject by subject. She said that subject specialists now feel more confident in canceling print titles. Chris Cole said the **National Agricultural Library** does not buy packages. The institution negotiates electronic items title by title and has negotiated permanent data rights. As NAL cancels

print versions, subject specialists know there is a permanent version accessible to them. NAL is looking forward to canceling print journals, because they are stored on site permanently.

Dianne McCutcheon said that the **National Library of Medicine** has not canceled print because the institution's mission is to serve as a national archive. She wonders what will happen with print copy if everyone goes electronic with journals. She pointed out that the print version is not always the same as the electronic and there are problems with negotiating interlibrary loan related to e-journals. Restrictions by country and type of electronic delivery system make the method of transmission for interlibrary loan difficult. Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) asked if anyone was running link checker on their e-journals. James Mouw replied that **University of Chicago** is running a link checker, but recently had to take a step back to redesign the process. Dianne McCutcheon said **NLM** has started to check links to monographs, but has not yet started looking at serials. Karen Calhoun said **Cornell** has started looking at link checkers and has been creating PURL links for some time to databases so they only have to make adjustments in one place. Beacher Wiggins added that **Library of Congress** is checking links for monographs now, not e-journals. Leighann Ayers said that **University of Michigan** is checking links for monographs and serials and that, for the most part, they are working fine. Irene Zimmerman mentioned that **University of Wisconsin-Madison** has been checking links for e-journals and has received positive feedback from public service staff.

Lee Leighton, **University of California at Berkeley**, asked how institutions are informing the public as they cancel print versions. Katharine Farrell replied that **Princeton** is making it explicit in their cataloging records that the print version of e-journals has been canceled. Subject specialists at Princeton make these decisions and there are no surprises for the public.

(Break 15 minutes)

The committee altered the agenda here and moved to item 7, then proceeded on to item 6.

7. RDA (AACR3) (30 minutes) (Guest: Jennifer Bowen)

Handout distributed on email before the discussion to Big Heads members

**From AACR to RDA
Executive Summary**

The two international committees who oversee the development of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)* met in Chicago from April 24-28, 2005 to discuss the best way to proceed with the development of a new cataloging code to replace *AACR2*, the current edition of this widely-used standard for library cataloging. Increasingly *AACR2* is

criticized for being too complex, too dependent upon outmoded card catalog concepts, and too difficult to apply to new types of digital resources.

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) and the Committee of Principals for AACR (CoP) discussed feedback received recently from library constituencies and other rule-making bodies on a draft of Part 1 of an intended new edition of AACR. The committees reaffirmed the need to develop a new code to replace AACR2. However, the feedback was clear that a different approach is required than what was represented in the draft of Part 1.

To signify the change in direction, the JSC and CoP have agreed on a new working title for the code: *RDA: Resource Description and Access*.

RDA will be a new standard for resource description and access designed for the digital world. *RDA* will provide:

- A more flexible framework for addressing the challenges of describing digital resources
- Data that is more readily adaptable to newly emerging, more efficient, database structures
- Data that is compatible with existing records already in online library catalogs because of *RDA*'s foundations in the principles set by AACR

RDA will be designed as an online product for use in a Web environment. It will have the following specific features:

- Organization around IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)* and related new data models
- Instructions for recording data presented independently of guidelines for data display, to provide more flexibility for records used in a variety of online environments.
- More "user-friendly" layout and formatting, with instructions written in "plain" English so that the code can be used more easily beyond the library world.

In addition to the constituencies formally represented on the JSC and the CoP, major stakeholders in the development of *RDA* include library administrators, system developers, metadata communities, MARC format developers and international cataloging

programs. As *RDA* is developed, drafts of each section of the new standard will be made available for these major stakeholders to review, and the developers of *RDA* will actively seek feedback from all of these groups.

The publication of *RDA* is now planned for 2008.

A more complete report of the meetings of the Joint Steering Committee is available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0504out.html>

Big Heads Discussion:

Jennifer Bowen will summarize recent developments and plans. Discussion questions:
What role will the revised code play in our increasingly diverse metadata environment?
What are the needs for, and impacts of, code changes from administrators' perspectives?

Jennifer Bowen (**University of Rochester**) said she is looking forward to feedback on the new edition of AACR2. Bowen serves on the Joint Steering Committee for AACR (JSC) as the representative for the American Library Association. She reported that the JSC met with the Committee on Principals (CoP) and decided on a new direction for the revision of cataloging rules. The new cataloging code to replace AACR2 will be called Resource Description and Access, as indicated in the executive summary above. *RDA* provides a flexible framework for cataloging original materials, creating data compatible with that created under AACR2. She stated that the work currently being done on the new edition of AACR2 is not something happening out of the blue. It is a very long process dating back to the 1997 International Conference of Experts in Toronto, when there was discussion on problems with AACR. At that time a strategic plan was made and a process put in place for revising the rules. Why do we need something else, she asked? Because we are identifying issues with the current structure of rules that do not serve us well in the digital age. AACR2 was first published in 1978 and is now expensive to revise and labor intensive to restructure.

Bowen reported that over the last few months, part of what was then called AACR3 (now *RDA*) was reviewed by six constituencies of JSC, who examined the draft and made comments. JSC has heard from rule makers in 7 countries and many countries that use AACR are looking at the revision. AACR has been translated into 25 languages. Comments have emerged that the first draft was not progressive, simplified and streamlined enough for use in other metadata communities. Other comments from administrators were that they do not want to see expensive changes in the code that require retraining staff and creating new documentation. Others want records created using *RDA* to be compatible with AACR2. The committee also heard from administrators that if radical changes are not going to occur in the code, then they would prefer no changes at all. JSC and CoP need to reconcile these differing responses and address both of these issues.

So, Bowen asked, how do we prepare for the impact of a changed code? Lee Leighton (**University of California at Berkeley**) asked what drastic changes were proposed. Bowen replied that most changes had to do with making rules more usable for metadata communities, from bringing about gradual to more drastic changes (i.e. data dictionary approach). What the JSC and CoP are doing is a compromise between these two ideas, moving away from including ISBD displays, although CCDA does not support this idea. The committee wants to maintain a good working relationship with the ISBD community, but the committee wants to move to content standard rather than a display standard. JSC and CoP are also investigating whether it is possible to keep ISBD as a possible display standard to work with the new content standard, since the two standards are closely intertwined.

RDA will contain 3 parts: Part 1: description, Part 2: relationship between records, and Part 3: authority control. The committee is now dealing with Part 1, along with radical proposals on the table for addressing sources of information. Discussions surrounding Part 2 have to do with primary access points. JSC has asked constituencies for proposals to streamline this area. Part 3 is going in a conservative direction, trying to make rules easier to understand for those not processing special materials. The committee does not want to make drastic changes here. Bowen said that technical solutions are being discussed on how things should display in online catalogs and that vendors should be engaged to begin thinking about how to display information in OPACs. JSC and CoP are discussing a possible meeting on this topic with the MARBI community.

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) commented that it struck him that the revised timeline of three years argues for a more conservative approach. He commented that OPACs will not be the only source for resource discovery and that he is more concerned with consistency in OPACs. Karen Calhoun (**Cornell**) said that we need to begin thinking about principles for OPAC use that will last and ask ourselves whether the catalog will be the same or will we use a distributed model for holding data in OPACs rather than putting everything in them.

Brian Schottlaender (**University of California at San Diego - audience**) said that RDA should be appealing to other metadata communities. He stated that as the committee begins to think of canceling ISBD punctuation that it should be cognizant of other transmission standards that are relative to ISBD. In his opinion, too much is being made of the tension between those arguing for radical change and those arguing for low cost of implementation of change. Another audience member commented that we now have better tools for making radical changes in authority records as opposed to those available when we implemented AACR2. She wondered about a statement made that the committee is being conservative about changes to authority data. Bowen replied that many libraries use AACR2 and the committee will continue to hear and consider ideas from those libraries that still are collecting heavily in print. Bowen added that authority control is the most expensive aspect of cataloging operations and that simplification in that area is needed. Joyce Ogburn (**University of Washington**) said libraries need to have tools outside of the catalog where we feel other types of authority control might be possible.

The discussion turned to training of catalogers in the new code. Cynthia Shelton (**University of California at Los Angeles**) said she is not concerned about resources for training, but rather the demographics. Libraries are seeing a great turnover with retirements, which will change cataloging departments. Her library is more concerned about increasing efficiency. Beacher Wiggins (**Library of Congress**) commented that LC is looking at the cost of training and documentation. **Library of Congress** will not be drafting new Rule Interpretations once the RDA is published, but rather using the code as the tool that is principles driven. He said that RDA will impact particularly on new staff and prospective staff in library schools, in that RDA will be easier to teach and orient new catalogers and students. Administrators at LC worry about cataloging expenses and their impact on staffing, which make them look to RDA as a source to reduce cataloging costs. LC has put together a one-page document on this topic that he offered to share with Big Heads members.

Speaking of the skill set that catalogers now need, Karen Calhoun said **Cornell** is implementing a new content management system for its university web sites using metadata to make things accessible in a way that is needed. She wants to be able to hire someone who can communicate and collaborate on metadata and indexing issues with the project manager setting up a university web site--for example for the college of engineering--as well as understand RDA. Dianne McCutcheon (**NLM**) commented that we should make this tool (RDA) more widely available and usable to other communities, moving beyond libraries and thinking of others creating data.

Cynthia Clark said that **New York Public Library** is thinking about looking at the family of positions that make up a cataloger and redefining that. She suggested that libraries need to bring in new people who can handle a variety of metadata systems in order to speak to new communities. Jane Ouderkirk (**Harvard**) maintained that there may be substantial costs associated with the new code and that she is already concerned about expenditures for what we are doing now. Sally Rogers (audience) said **Ohio State University** is working on putting content into a repository, working with engineers on storing metadata. Faculty does not have time to catalog records for repository. She questioned whether libraries could begin to look at batch processing rather than focusing on cataloging item by item. Bowen replied that JSC and CoP have had discussions on this and are considering adding to RDA an appendix that discusses how to implement the code in ways that address how libraries create records that differ from institution to institution.

An audience member asked whether any thought was given to how users use information through resource discovery. Will there be user focus groups? Bowen replied that the committee is starting to discuss focus groups, although JSC is not set up to do that. They are a content-based committee, but she stated that she would be happy to have people involved in resource discovery work with the JSC regarding putting focus groups in place. The committee wants to put its effort into tying the rules into what the user is trying to process. No user study is currently in place, but one needs to be done.

6. Trends in technical services: (60 minutes)

Discussion of selected trends, their impact, and effects on planning.

- a. Modularization and extension of “integrated” systems.
- b. Commodification of “some” cataloging data.
- c. Re-professionalization of technical services staff as metadata consultants to faculty, digital projects, special collections.
- d. Changing demographics of technical services staff.

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) began the discussion by stating that libraries that now have integrated library systems are converting to content and resource management systems. Some libraries have adopted federated searching systems. All these new systems need to interoperate to some degree. Columbia is seeing several impacts from use of these systems, in particular a need for standards. Wolven stated that vendors normally develop standards after they create the product. Libraries now have more relations with different vendors, which increases the number of users in the library community. Wolven said he is interested in hearing whether a lack of standards was a concern with the rest of the Big Heads committee members and how they are dealing with it. At the Big Heads meeting held during ALA Midwinter 2005, there was much discussion of e-resource management systems, with no conclusions on the best course of action. He asked whether the committee thought libraries will be seeing multiple content management systems and whether we need to see different sets of integration service layers.

James Mouw said that at **University of Chicago**, those who contribute data to the ILS are not people who maintain the backend and not the same people who maintain content on web pages. Keeping these three areas in synch is an uphill battle for his institution. Karen Calhoun (**Cornell**) said they want ILS vendors to stay in business and to maintain professional relationships with staff at vendor sites. **Cornell** wants to know what Big Heads are thinking of concerning the sustainability of technical services. Nancy Gibbs of **Duke University** said the bottom line is that much thought needs to be given to technical services. Libraries are being asked to use internal funds as best as possible and have difficulty increasing the budget for technical services needs.

Joyce Ogburn (**University of Washington**) stated that libraries need to ask questions about trends and what we are doing for things that impact our future. Lisa German of the **University of Illinois** said that many times libraries do not work in the way they are structured, but rather function in a vacuum. Libraries need to begin seeing limitations on the structure of how we get work done. Libraries need to think more broadly and bring multiple parties to the table because of the variety of operations that intertwine. If this is not done, technical services suffers. Ogburn said that help from ALA is needed to get to other communities. Libraries need to insert themselves into users’ lives instead of waiting for them to come to us. Libraries are becoming with time less of an avenue for getting to content. There is much content outside of the publishing stream. Ogburn questioned how libraries are getting to that information and recommended that emphasis be placed on special needs collections and new approaches to learning. Libraries, she said, should be

worrying about how to incorporate new approaches to learning into the training curriculum.

Wrap-up and discussion of future agenda topics. (15 minutes)

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) asked what topics resonate for future agenda items. Beacher Wiggins (**Library of Congress**) said that under the subtopic of trends, it is intriguing that Big Heads libraries are having staff perform duties beyond the organizational structure of their respective institutions. Getting to the core of this issue is something he thinks that Big Heads needs to address, to deal with planning of initiatives such as RDA. ILS vendors are not going to fine-tune their systems, Beacher said. Knowing this, he questioned what that means for modernization of cataloging operations and how we are dealing with changes in the responsibilities of cataloging and acquisitions staff. At the **Library of Congress**, Wiggins is looking to combine the functions of cataloging and acquisitions. He would like to see that topic addressed in the future.

Bob Wolven (**Columbia**) said that the question of institutional structure raises another issue of what exactly is technical services. He asked if it was worth pursuing this question, to hear from a cross section of groups from technical services, public services, acquisitions and collection development all at the same table, rather than holding separate meetings at ALA. Jane Ouderkirk (**Harvard**) said she is interested in having at the table people invested in harvesting data at corporations, because they have developed more sophisticated tools than ILS vendors. There was agreement to develop a joint agenda for ALA annual 2006 with all stakeholders included.